

REDMOND PARK BOARD
Minutes
March 4, 2004
Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

I. Call to order

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:00 p.m.

Board members present: Chair Lori Snodgrass, Seth Kelsey, David Degenstein, Ann Callister, Suzanne Querry, Sue Stewart; Youth Advocate Katherine Zak

Absent and excused: David Ladd

City staff present: Tim Cox, Manager of Parks Planning; Danny Hopkins, Parks and Recreation Director; Jean Rice, Parks Planning; Mike Paul, Public Works; Sarah Stiteler, Planning Department; Pam Maybee, Recording Secretary

Welcome to Citizen Guests: Miguel Llanos, Kris Snider, Jeff Benesi, Theresa Watson, Michele Meston

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion for approval of February 5, 2004 Redmond Park Board minutes as submitted by: Sue Stewart

Second by: Ann Calister

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

III. Items from the Audience

Miguel Llanos, Friends of the Redmond Library and Redmond Historical Society, expressed concern for the state of the Slough House Park and the Dudley Carter house, noting it had been eight months since a transfer had been considered from King County to the City. (He submitted a handout for the record). He reported that a person had been "squatting" in the building and it was deteriorating. Llanos emphasized that more care needed to be taken of the house, noting vulnerability of the artwork there.

Hopkins explained the City acted quickly several months ago, and then an agreement was sent back to King County. Now it was in the County's hands and their legal department who would make a decision. There were issues regarding maintenance and restoration as well as ownership of the Dudley Carter artwork, which staff needed to plan with the Arts Commission, Parks Maintenance and the Recreation Departments.

Snodgrass suggested the Park Board send a letter to King County expressing these concerns. Hopkins requested the draft first be reviewed by the Mayor prior to sending it to the County.

Motion to approve to send a letter to King County expressing concerns for the deterioration of the Slough House by: Suzanne Querry

Second by: Ann Calister

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

Llanos will forward a list to Snodgrass and pictures of the artwork pieces that are of particular concern. Snodgrass will route the email to all members.

IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

A. Additions

- New Business: Add Green Gateway Land
- New Business: Delete V.I.E. Board Re-Appointment

B. Handouts

- Parks for Sale
- PRO Plan Memo from Staff to Board

V. Old Business

A. Municipal Campus Master Plan

Kris Snider, Principal, and Jeff Benesi, Senior Associate, of Hewett Architects were introduced as the landscape design team for the Municipal Campus Master Plan. Mr. Snider presented a comprehensive explanation following input from the January 29 Charette, and asked the Board for their input. He noted the remaining input process would be as follows:

- March 30: Public hearing

- March, April, May: Architects meet with Arts and Trails Commissions and Design Review Board
- May: Public meeting

Snider referenced a handout of summaries from the Charette, as well as a handout of principles and goals they desire to meet. The Charette yielded three broad ideas/schemes; no details have formed as yet, only a "big picture" concept. Snider stated that all three alternatives offered a new entry sequence, and all integrated artwork.

- **Alternative A**

- ◇ Soft native landscape
- ◇ Incorporates a linear water course landscape, carrying the theme from the Sammamish River itself (could be interpretive and educational)
- ◇ Soft landscape with informal paths
- ◇ A continuum of landscape running through
- ◇ Civic quality is in front of the City Hall
- ◇ Softer, curved accesses

- **Alternative A-1**

- ◇ Expanding the water system to offer a series of ponds with a bio-filtration system (stormwater from 85th Street to the River)

- **Alternative B**

- ◇ A blended scheme: natural with ordered/structured
- ◇ A "soft" urban thrust of the city toward City Hall, meeting water environs at the Hall
- ◇ More ornamental plantings, more ordered landscape
- ◇ Viewing platform down the river and back to campus
- ◇ Create a gateway into the space from the trail
- ◇ Interactive water feature, iconic element viewed from trail/street
- ◇ Safety is paramount and providing activity throughout many hours of the day and throughout all seasons of the year (as much as possible)

- **Alternative C:**

- ◇ Strong urban gesture from 160th to the river
- ◇ There is "edge" (e.g., steps) with open space, activating each space with occasional water ways/features
- ◇ Promenades
- ◇ Terraced, organized features with soft elements (e.g., down to the River Trail)

Mr. Benesi noted the photos used with each alternative were those favored at the Charette.

The Board discussed the Concept Opportunities and Concept Constraints handout and offered additional input:

- Kelsey
 - ◇ The Charette favored passive, therefore he favored alternative A, as that would fit that description/choice.
 - ◇ A-1 looks crowded; alternative A has more usable space.
 - ◇ Favored curves (e.g., the curved entrance) vs. the linear pathways and roads.
 - ◇ Questioned maintenance of bio-filtration.
 - ◇ Asked if a monument of McRedmond or Perrigo had been considered.
- Calister
 - ◇ Alternative A's "Constraint" statement that says, "Lacks traditional civic characteristics" belongs under an "Opportunity."
 - ◇ Alternative B has wasted space and higher maintenance.
 - ◇ Saw Alternative A as inviting, especially those who work and live downtown.
 - ◇ The campus is not just for those who work there—it is an oasis in the City for people that live there.
- Query
 - ◇ Concerned about the tree canopy coverage and getting sun in; how much sun would be present. (Benesi noted that they could mix and match the three alternatives; each could build tree cover up or down.)
 - ◇ A-1 creates a visual corridor more than alternative A.
 - ◇ A-1 creates a sense of openness, although not as usable.
 - ◇ Concerned for safety for the Sammamish River Trail, if trying to create a more social gathering area, as the trail is an arterial. (Snider does see the potential for conflict there.)
 - ◇ Favored alternative A with lower coverage to create more openness, noting people in Northwest value an uninterrupted view.
- Stewart
 - ◇ Favored Alternative B: it has a touch of history with the meandering trail and expanse of water theme.
 - ◇ Alternative C is too formal and segregated in a series of spaces.
 - ◇ Liked the connection across the campus.
 - ◇ Favored curves vs. the linear pathways and roads.
- Zak

- ◇ Favored the interactive water feature in B. (Benesi noted that all alternatives would have an interactive water feature.)
- Snodgrass
 - ◇ Favored water elements of alternative A.
 - ◇ Disappointed in all the alternatives.
 - ◇ Wooded native growth doesn't match a campus feel.
 - ◇ Favored light coming into City Hall open to the west.
 - ◇ Did not favor dense; rather, openness and connectivity.
 - ◇ Saw too much segmentation. (Benesi clarified that Architects do see it as interconnected, not segmented; spaces are interconnected.)
 - ◇ Favored a more inviting plan to people who come in and enjoy, as well as those working there to want to interact out.
 - ◇ Saw constraints with these schemes.
 - ◇ Favored the curved driveway entrances.
- Degenstein
 - ◇ Favored alternative C but liked all the alternatives.
 - ◇ Alternative C has long walkways connecting and openness; being downtown is an urban setting.
 - ◇ Favored alternatives B & C's large plaza areas (more than A).
 - ◇ Liked a feature that attracts trail users to stop and linger.

All Board members complimented the architects on a great job in creating concepts from the input to date—a good reflection of Charette discussion. Snider noted they would build a scale model showing detail, designed with the preferred alternative.

Snodgrass asked for smaller reduced size pictures of the three alternatives for packets next month. Mike Paul, Public Works, stated the three alternatives would be online for viewing, so they would not need copies in their packets.

Cox stated that following presentations to the Boards and Commissions, and the public meeting on March 30, comments would be summarized to present to the Board on April 1, and to present a preferred alternative. ***Members were asked to e-mail any additional comments to Cox.***

Paul explained that the City's Natural Resources Department could fund part of construction if they used some of the campus area ponds to filter the City water runoff. Snodgrass asked ***Paul to obtain any requirements of which Natural Resources might be thinking, should there be a bio-filtration system. Specifically, the Board would like to know what it would take to***

make it viable, and if moving water would work with it. Paul noted the top foot can be moving water. There would be a pump system in place to pump it from the street.

Degenstein asked Hopkins which alternative could add a bio-filter. Paul noted the water must have enough volume. Hopkins clarified the Board would like to see a realistic impact. *He asked Paul to answer what kind of volume that is being proposed in each alternative—Paul will follow up.*

B. Idylwood Park

1. Public Comments

Michele Meston, Redmond citizen, Fairweather Condominiums in the Idylwood neighborhood offered these comments opposing the Sammamish Rowing Association (SRA) at Idylwood Park:

- *Sports Etc.* magazine has not listed rowing as a paramount sport according to statistics.
- King County has renewed the contract with SRA at the existing Marymoor site; therefore, SRA could expand the existing building, following approval by the City.
- Sammamish State Park will be expanding to more room and parking spaces.
- Possible parking limitations at Idylwood. (Note: Jean Rice, Planning Department, stated parking is not restricted in terms of space; if parking is expanded substantially, then storm water runoff must be dealt with.)
- Commercialism has not been allowed on the Lake.
- Lake Sammamish is now polluted with phosphates and fertilizers, etc.

Rice followed with these comments:

- An agreement must provide a mutual benefit for the City (i.e., the public) and SRA. The City would get space through SRA's community building; Parks could also have their own kayaking program.
- SRA is a non-profit organization.

Additional comments by staff:

- One more public hearing is proposed for Idylwood, Opportunity Study in May.

- Funding is only available for the playground area (no other funding is available now).
- The playground is at the same location in all plans (A, B, C, and D)
- City Council approved the funding at last night's meeting (3/3/04).
- Construction for the playground may begin by the summer.
- A "phasing" approach must be considered in building the park.

The Board recognized an obligation to SRA to let them know, regardless of what plan was chosen.

Theresa Watson, Redmond citizen, Fairweather Condominiums in the Idylwood neighborhood:

- Main concern is traffic and impact of the SRA coming into the park.
- It is most congested where the rowing team is located now.
- Concern SRA would bring in many more cars and noise as well.

2. Staff Presentations

Hopkins elaborated on the Idylwood Park concept diagram "D" (the fourth drawing):

- SRA building moved to grassy promenade area because of parking that would be needed.
- Building would need to be in footprint of existing building.
- Parking would need to be addressed at the site (to expand from 48 stalls).
- Parking is proposed to double to 70 spaces.
- SRA is now examining size and location the City has set for the building.
- Construct a boardwalk on the water (make it not attractive for mooring).
- Design "D" reflects identifying opportunities and gives a citing of opportunities for a coordinated phase approach; the plan is sensitive to the desires of the community and consistency with the character of the site.
- Launch site: TBD.
- Possibly re-contour the swimming area, so sand does not migrate further north from the dock; a re-contour would provide more beach.

Board members' comments to the presentation:

- Kelsey would not make a final decision until after the last hearing; but presently, he did not support bringing SRA into the park:
 - Most of the public is opposed and not supportive.

- SRA is proceeding with King County's affiliation and expanding the existing building; therefore, he does not see the need to bring them to Idylwood.
- Would create crowding issue at Idylwood and be overwhelming to the park.
- Move playground to sand volleyball (flip-flop the two).
- Degenstein agreed with Kelsey to not support bringing SRA into the Park, but will wait with comments until after the last hearing.
 - Expanding to 95 parking spaces (not 70) would better serve the City. (Note: Hopkins clarified that phasing would go to 70 first, and keep options for later, possibly to 95 spaces.)
 - Favored design "D" - leave picnic shelter and open area as is.
 - Remove the existing building and keep design D concept.
 - Provide more parking spaces on the park side.
 - Do not remove trees from upper lot. (NOTE: Rice stated trees would not be taken down.)
- Calister supported SRA:
 - To expand the only Lake access.
 - It is a City park, not a neighborhood park.
 - People who are supportive have not come forth due to the general apathetic nature of Redmond citizens.
- Stewart
 - Rowing house should stay within the existing footprint; those constraints might change SRA's decision.
 - Could improve SRA traffic by moving it to Idylwood, since current location is a narrower congested traffic area.
- Zak favored the picnic area location in the meadow, leaving open area as is.
- Querry
 - Concerned about sand volleyball close to picnic shelter.
 - Favored moving dock north, improving the beach.
 - Did not believe the City had an obligation to the rowing club.
 - Although SRA is a rowing hub of the nation, it does not seem it is what the City is about; rather, it is a passive recreation park.
 - SRA parking lot is full at prime park hours, thus concerned about the conflict that it would create.
- Snodgrass
 - Favored relocation of dock and swimming area improvements.
 - Favored boardwalk, an element to provide for fishing.

- Consider locating picnic shelter at top part of open meadow area for the view and proximity to the parking lot.
- Flip-flop playground with sand volleyball. *(She asked staff to look into this possibility.)*
- Important to keep footprint of building as a constraining element to offer; this may drive SRA's decision.
- Asked staff to look into providing that type of recreational element at the beach—not necessarily with another organization. Users would pay; it would provide citizens with access to water during regular programming hours, minimizing impact to the neighborhood.
- Do not remove any trees from the upper lot.
- Supported a pedestrian "fly-over" bridge to get people off the street; short of that, a hand-operated stoplight.

Snodgrass commended staff for the concept design, noting it reflected the comments from the public as well as the Park Board. She asked staff *to publicize the next public hearing, to be held possibly in May*, since the City campus meeting is in April. She also asked staff to *report whether or not the flip/flop of the sand volleyball with the picnic shelter is doable; Rice will follow up with the report.*

C. PRO Plan

Cox reported that Sections 1-5 of the Preliminary Draft of the PRO Plan are done, including graphics and maps. Sections 6-8 will be edited and distributed about 3/16/04. He noted the following:

- Policies have been removed.
- Citizen surveys were used extensively.
- Per capita standards/guidelines/recommendations were put into simple language and have stayed the same.
- Taken on a more budget-based park improvement program to guide into 6-10 year development.
- Included arts and cultural resources: elevated them to a new level of awareness.

PRO Plan schedule:

- Park Board comments in April, followed by a possible Planning Commission review
- Study session with City Council with an update: Late April/early May
- Adoption in May by Park Board

- Adoption in June by City Council

Cox noted the Planning Commission has discussed and validated the PRO Plan as the implementation document of the Comprehensive Plan. Cox will e-mail for Board comments those pictures that would be used for the PRO Plan.

D. Volunteer Award

Calister turned over the Volunteer Award project to the Parks Department last October/November. Staff evaluation is proceeding.

VI. New Business

A. Arts Commission Video

Deferred to next month.

B. Downtown Chapter of Comp Plan Revisions

Sarah Stiteler, Planning Department, has been working on the Parks chapter of the Comp Plan. She also has worked on the Downtown chapter, and noted that the Parks element is a significant portion of that. She presented policies to the Park Board for the proposed downtown chapter.

The public review process is now underway:

- Monday night, 3/8/04, 6:30-8:30 p.m.: Public meeting on the downtown plan
- 3/10 study session on the policies
- 3/17 public hearing
- 1 or 2 study sessions following

Stiteler emphasized that now is the time to make comments. She believed feedback from Parks' Boards and Commissions was reflected in the policies; she asked the Board to let her know if they were not. ***Comments can be e-mailed to Cox, and he will forward them to Stiteler.***

Stiteler referenced a memo (3/3/04) with summary comments from the joint meeting from February 18. Feedback from that meeting was reflected in the policies also. Included in handouts was the extended Planning Commission agenda, which indicated the Downtown policies and Parks policies in a generic

manner, giving Parks policies direction. Stiteler invited members to the Planning Commission meeting; some of parks staff would also be attending.

Cox reported that staff has made comments to Planning staff that helped "fine tune" some policies.

C. Grant Opportunities/IAC and Conservation Futures

Cox referenced the handout of the invitation to apply for Conservation Futures tax levy funds and the IAC grant. Cox reported there is land acquisition opportunity in the Bear Creek watershed that would go with Bear-Evans Creek Trail (BECT), as well as possibly tributary acquisition property. One is adjacent/north to Perrigo Park, which could enhance that experience. It is possible to gain funding efficiencies with a matching grant (50%).

Staff is looking into IAC eligibility, evaluating whether funding is there. The City could possibly be eligible for an IAC grant to purchase two pieces of land that would connect Avondale Road and Union Hill Road (trail easements), which would continue the Bear-Evans linkages from the downtown. *Cox will report more next month.*

D. Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Hopkins referenced the handout of the TOD report from the January 21 meeting. The Department of Transportation also presented their ideas on the Park and Ride at that meeting. He reported the City would hold off on the 83rd Street corridor study due to TOD's ideas on how it would be impacted. The Skate Park could also incur improvements/impacts. Next month *Hopkins will bring DOT's proposal.*

Snodgrass asked for comments from the Board next month on TOD as well as any impacts of Skate Park character changes the Board might be open to; staff will follow up. Hopkins also noted it would be economically unfeasible for a central park location at the Park and Ride; the City must capitalize on other opportunities, i.e., the Municipal campus.

E. Board Re-Appointment (Chair & Vice-Chair)

Deferred to next month. *Snodgrass asked members to let her know if they are thinking about the Chair or Vice Chair positions.*

F. Heron Rookery - "Green Gateway" Article

Snodgrass referenced the King County Journal article "City of Redmond gets 'green gateway' land." She noted it was her understanding that nothing would prevent designating the shop site area as protected. She asked the Board whether or not they wished to recommend to City Council that the area be permanently designated as protected open space under "native growth protection." She cited Council president McCormick's supportive statement to "leave it green and untouched."

Hopkins will bring to next month's meeting elements of the property, e.g., classifications, etc., defining its preservation state and community access. It does need to be considered, with the Board expressing their desire as to what those actions should be. *Staff will report back.*

G. Bond Committee

Snodgrass expressed desire to meet with the consultant on the Park Bond in mid-March. Questions that came up at the last Bond Committee meeting would need responses in order to come up with a date to put before the public, noting lead time is getting shorter. *Cox will contact Trust for Public Lands to confirm availability and dates, and will e-mail Snodgrass.* The Board asked for a one to 1-1/2 hour meeting, starting at either 6:00 p.m. or 6:30 p.m., Wednesday March 10 (or 3/17 if the 10th was not available). *Cox will e-mail with confirmation.*

VII. Reports

A. Upcoming Events

- Fire Station 11 Art Plaza Dedication, April 1, 2:00 p.m.
- May Tour
 - *Snodgrass asked Members to bring their thoughts next month of sites they would like to tour.*
- CIP
- TMP

VIII. Adjournment

Redmond Park Board

March 4, 2004

Page 13

Motion to adjourn by: Seth Kelsey

Second by: Suzanne Querry

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

By: _____
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

Date

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Pam Maybee

Next Regular Meeting

April 1, 2004

7:00 p.m.

Location: Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center